

Homogeneity properties in large compact S -spaces

Ramiro de la Vega

February 1, 2008

Abstract

Under $\diamond$ we show how to construct a large compact S -space while having some control over its group of autohomeomorphisms. In particular we can make the space rigid or h -homogeneous (i.e. any two clopen subsets are homeomorphic). We also get a space which is B -homogeneous and not h -homogeneous. A topological space is B -homogeneous if it has a base every element of which can be mapped onto every other one by a homeomorphism of the whole space.

1 Introduction

A space is *hereditarily separable* (HS) if every subspace is separable. An S -space is a regular HS space with a non-Lindelöf subspace. A space X is *homogeneous* if for every $x, y \in X$ there is a homeomorphism f of X onto X with $f(x) = y$. In [3], Fedorchuk constructed under $\diamond$ a compact S -space of size $2^{\aleph_1}$ (in fact with every point of the space having character $\aleph_1$). There are compact homogeneous S -spaces under CH (see [1]) but by classic results such a space must have size at most $2^{\aleph_0}$. In this paper we show how to construct a Fedorchuk space (i.e. compact, HS and with no non-trivial convergent sequences) keeping control over its group of autohomeomorphisms. This allows us to get such spaces with various homogeneity properties.

A topological space is *B -homogeneous* if it has a base every element of which can be mapped onto every other one by a homeomorphism of the whole space. A zero-dimensional space is *h -homogeneous* if any two clopen subsets are homeomorphic to each other. It is shown in [5] that any B -homogeneous

zero-dimensional first-countable compact space is h -homogeneous (and hence homogeneous). Matveev also constructed an example of a pseudocompact zero-dimensional B -homogeneous space which is not h -homogeneous, and he asked whether any B -homogeneous zero-dimensional compact space is h -homogeneous. We show that under $\diamond$ the answer is no. In fact our example is a Fedorchuk space. We can also get an h -homogeneous Fedorchuk space and a rigid one (i.e. one for which the only autohomeomorphism of the space is the identity map).

We use an inverse limit approach similar to the one used in [2], where $\diamond$ is used to capture (and eventually destroy) all potential left separated ω_1 -sequences, making the space HS . In order to keep control over the autohomeomorphisms of the space we need to do two things: we need to destroy some potential autohomeomorphisms (for which we use $\diamond$ again), but we also want to preserve some of them, for which we use a “lifting” technique used in [4] for getting certain kind of L -spaces. In Section 2 we introduce some terminology and give basic facts used during the construction. In Section 3 we introduce the lifting technique mentioned before, which will be used at the successor stages of the inverse limit. The main construction is done in Section 4; we recommend the reader to go straight to that section and go back to previous sections as needed. Finally in Section 5 we explain briefly how to use the main construction to get the various spaces we mentioned at the beginning.

2 General Facts and Terminology

Suppose G is a group acting on a topological space X .

Definition 2.1 *We say that $f \in \text{Hom}(X)$ is locally in G if for every $x \in X$ there is an open neighborhood U of x and a $g \in G$ such that $f(u) = g(u)$ for all $u \in U$. We write $H(X, G)$ for the set of autohomeomorphisms of X which are locally in G .*

Note that if X is compact and zero-dimensional then f is locally in G if and only if there is a finite partition $\{P_i : i \in I\}$ of X into clopen subsets and there is a finite $\{g_i : i \in I\} \subseteq G$ such that $f \upharpoonright P_i = g_i$ for all $i \in I$. Also note that $H(X, G)$ is actually a subgroup of $\text{Hom}(X)$ and that $H(X, H(X, G)) = H(X, G)$.

Definition 2.2 *Two subsets $A, B \subseteq X$ are G -equivalent if there is an $f \in H(X, G)$ such that $fA = B$.*

Lemma 2.1 *Suppose that $U \subseteq X$ is clopen and let $\mathcal{B}$ be the set of all clopen subsets of X which are G -equivalent to U . If $\mathcal{B}$ is a π -base for X and $X = \bigcup \mathcal{B}$ then $\mathcal{B}$ is a base for X .*

Proof. Fix a clopen $V \subseteq X$ and $x \in V$. We want to find an element of $\mathcal{B}$ contained in V and containing x . Without loss of generality there is a $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $B \subseteq X \setminus V$. Since $X = \bigcup \mathcal{B}$, there is an $f \in H(X, G)$ such that $x \in fB$, and we can fix $W \subseteq B$ clopen such that $x \in f(W) \subset V$. Since B is a π -base, there is an $f' \in H(X, G)$ such that $f'(B) \subseteq V \setminus f(W)$. Now we define $h \in H(X, G)$ as follows: if $x \in W$ we let $h(x) = f(x)$, if $x \in B \setminus W$ we let $h(x) = f'(x)$, if $x \in f(W)$ we let $h(x) = f^{-1}(x)$, if $x \in f'(B \setminus W)$ we let $h(x) = f'^{-1}(x)$ and we let $h(x) = x$ otherwise. Then clearly $h \in H(X, G)$ and $x \in hB \subseteq V$. Thus hB is the desired element of $\mathcal{B}$. ♠

Definition 2.3 *Given a countable sequence S of closed subsets of the Cantor space C and given closed $A_0, A_1 \subseteq C$, we say that (A_0, A_1) preserves S if whenever $x \in A_0 \cap A_1$ is a strong limit point of S and U is an open neighborhood of x , there are $n_0, n_1 \in \text{dom}(S)$ with $S(n_0) \subseteq U \setminus A_1$ and $S(n_1) \subseteq U \setminus A_0$.*

Definition 2.4 *Given a countable set $\mathcal{S}$ of countable sequences of closed subsets of the Cantor space C and given a convergent sequence $B = \{b_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq C$ with limit point b ; we say that B avoids $\mathcal{S}$, if whenever b is a strong limit point of $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and U is an open neighborhood of b , there is an $n \in \text{dom}(S)$ such that $S(n) \subseteq U \setminus (B \cup \{b\})$.*

Note in particular that any constant sequence avoids any set $\mathcal{S}$ and hence satisfies the hypothesis of the next lemma.

Lemma 2.2 *Suppose $\mathcal{S}$ is a countable set of countable sequences of closed subsets of the Cantor space C . Suppose also that $B = \{b_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq C$ is a convergent sequence which avoids $\mathcal{S}$ and let b be its limit point. Then there are closed $A_0, A_1 \subseteq C$ such that i) $A_0 \cup A_1 = C$, ii) $A_0 \cap A_1 = \{b\}$, iii) $B \subseteq A_0$ and iv) (A_0, A_1) preserves every sequence in $\mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. This result was essentially proved in [4, proof of Theorem 0.1]. The difference is that there they don't have the sequence B to worry about. Thus can assume here that the b_n 's are all distinct and all different from b . Note that the order type of the sequences in $\mathcal{S}$ is irrelevant so we may assume that $\mathcal{S} = \{\langle S_n^i : n \in \omega \rangle : i \in \omega\}$. Fix a decreasing sequence $\langle V_m : m \in \omega \rangle$ of clopen subsets of C such that $V_0 = C$ and $\bigcap_{m \in \omega} V_m = B \cup \{b\}$. We will construct inductively a decreasing sequence $\langle W_m : m \in \omega \rangle$ of clopen subsets of C such that $W_0 = C$, $W_m \subseteq V_m$ and $b_m \in W_{2m} \setminus W_{2m+1}$ for all $m \in \omega$. Note that $\bigcap_{m \in \omega} W_m = \{b\}$ and that if we let $A_0 = \{b\} \cup \bigcup_{m \in \omega} (W_{2m} \setminus W_{2m+1})$ and $A_1 = \{b\} \cup \bigcup_{m \in \omega} (V_{2m+1} \setminus V_{2m+2})$, then i), ii) and iii) are satisfied. Now we explain how to construct the sequence so that iv) is also satisfied.

Fix a local base $\{O_j : j \in \omega\}$ for b in C and a function $(\psi, \mu) : \omega \rightarrow \omega \times \omega$ such that $(\psi, \mu)^{-1}(i, j)$ contains at least one odd and one even natural number for each $(i, j) \in \omega \times \omega$. If W_{2m} is already defined and b is a strong limit point of $\langle S_n^{\psi(2m)} : n \in \omega \rangle$ then (since B avoids $\mathcal{S}$) there is an $n \in \omega$ such that $S_n^{\psi(2m)} \subseteq W_{2m} \cap O_{\mu(2m)}$ and $S_n^{\psi(2m)} \cap (B \cup \{b\}) = \emptyset$. Thus there is a $k \in \omega$ and a clopen neighborhood U of b_m such that $S_n^{\psi(2m)} \subseteq W_{2m} \setminus (V_k \cup U)$ and $U \cap B = \{b_m\}$; then we let $W_{2m+1} = (W_{2m} \cap V_k) \setminus U$. If b wasn't a strong limit point of $\langle S_n^{\psi(2m)} : n \in \omega \rangle$ then we just let $W_{2m+1} = (W_{2m} \cap V_{2m+1}) \setminus U$ where U is any clopen with $U \cap B = \{b_m\}$. Note that in either case we have that $\{b_k : k > m\} \subseteq W_{2m+1} \subseteq V_{2m+1} \cap W_{2m}$ and $b_m \notin W_{2m+1}$. If W_{2m+1} is already defined we follow the same steps (now working with $S^{\psi(2m+1)}$ and $O_{\mu(2m+1)}$) except that now we want to keep b_{m+1} inside W_{2m+2} , so we just let $W_{2m+2} = W_{2m+1} \cap V_k$ in the first case and $W_{2m+2} = W_{2m+1} \cap V_{2m+2}$ in the second case.

Now suppose that b is a strong limit point of $\langle S_n^i : n \in \omega \rangle$ and O is an open neighborhood of b . Then there is a $j \in \omega$ such that $b \in O_j \subseteq O$ and there are n_0 and n_1 such that $(\psi, \mu)(2n_0) = (\psi, \mu)(2n_1 + 1) = (i, j)$. It is clear from the construction that these n_0 and n_1 are as required in the definition of preserving $\langle S_n^i : n \in \omega \rangle$. ♠

We close this section with a result which was essentially proven in [4, Lemma 6.4]. There instead of two clopen sets K and L they had points a and b of the Cantor space and the requirement at the end was $ga = b$. However an almost identical argument shows the following.

Lemma 2.3 *Suppose G is a countable subgroup of autohomeomorphisms of the Cantor space C acting freely on C and suppose K and L are disjoint*

non-empty clopen subsets of C . Then there is an autohomeomorphism g of C such that $gK = L$ and $\langle G, g \rangle$ acts freely on C .

3 Lifting Homeomorphisms

Suppose G is a countable group acting freely on the Cantor space $C = 2^\omega$. Given two closed $A_0, A_1 \subseteq C$ and $p \in C$ such that $A_0 \cap A_1 = \{p\}$ and $A_0 \cup A_1 = C$, we let $Y = Y(A_0, A_1, G)$ be the space

$$Y = \{(x, \varphi) \in C \times 2^G : (\forall g \in G) (x \in gA_{\varphi(g)})\}.$$

We let G act on 2^G by $(g\varphi)(h) = \varphi(g^{-1}h)$ where g and h denote elements of G while φ and $g\varphi$ are in 2^G . Furthermore G acts on Y by $g(x, \varphi) = (gx, g\varphi)$.

For any choice of A_i 's we have that Y is a closed subspace of $C \times 2^G$ and the action described above is free and continuous. We also have that the projection into the first coordinate $\pi : Y \rightarrow C$ is surjective.

Lemma 3.1 *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a finite partition of Y into clopen subsets. Then there is a finite partition $\mathcal{Q}$ of C into clopen subsets and a function $\Psi : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow [\mathcal{P}]^{\leq 2}$ such that i) $\pi^{-1}Q \subseteq \bigcup \Psi(Q)$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and ii) whenever $|\Psi(Q)| = 2$, there is a unique $x \in Q$ such that $\Psi(Q)$ splits $\pi^{-1}(x)$.*

Proof. For each clopen $Q \subseteq C$ let $\Psi(Q) = \{P \in \mathcal{P} : P \cap \pi^{-1}Q \neq \emptyset\}$. Since the action of G is free we have that $|\pi^{-1}(x)| \leq 2$ for all $x \in C$. Thus given $x \in C$ there is a clopen neighborhood Q_x of x such that $|\Psi(Q)| \leq 2$. Now using compactness of C and taking boolean combinations we can get a finite partition $\mathcal{Q}'$ of C with $|\Psi(Q)| \leq 2$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{Q}'$. Now suppose that $Q \in \mathcal{Q}'$ is such that $|\Psi(Q)| = 2$. Since the two clopens in $\Psi(Q)$ only mention finitely many elements of G and $\Psi(Q)$ splits $\pi^{-1}(x)$ only if (maybe not even if) $x = gp$ for some g mentioned, we can further partition Q to isolate the finitely many such possible x 's. We then let $\mathcal{Q}$ to be the corresponding refinement of $\mathcal{Q}'$. ♠

Note that by the same argument, we can in fact get $\mathcal{Q}$ in the previous lemma so that it refines any finite partition of C given in advance.

The next result shows that non- G -equivalent clopens of C remain non- G -equivalent in Y .

Lemma 3.2 *Suppose that U, V are disjoint clopen subsets of C such that $\pi^{-1}U$ is G -equivalent to $\pi^{-1}V$. Then U and V are G -equivalent.*

Proof. Fix $f \in H(Y, G)$ such that $f(\pi^{-1}U) = \pi^{-1}V$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $f^2 = id$ and that $f \upharpoonright Y \setminus \pi^{-1}(U \cup V) = id$. Fix a finite partition $\mathcal{P}$ of Y into clopen sets so that f acts as a different element of G in each element of the partition. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a partition of C refining $\{U, V, C \setminus (U \cup V)\}$ as in the previous lemma with the corresponding $\Psi : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow [\mathcal{P}]^{\leq 2}$.

Let $S = \{x \in C : \pi^{-1}(x) \text{ is split by } \mathcal{P}\}$. Since $|S \cap Q| \leq 1$ for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, we have that S is finite. On the other hand, since the action of G in Y commutes with π , it is easy to see that $f(\pi^{-1}S) = \pi^{-1}S$ so we get that $|S \cap V| = |S \cap U|$. Then we can write $S \cap U = \{g_i p : i \in n\}$ and $S \cap V = \{h_j p : j \in n\}$ for some $n \in \omega$ and some g_i, h_j 's in G .

Now fix W a clopen neighborhood of p such that each $g_i W$ and each $h_j W$ is contained in an element of $\mathcal{Q}$. Let $W_U = \bigcup_{i \in n} g_i W$ and $W_V = \bigcup_{j \in n} h_j W$. We claim that $f(\pi^{-1}W_U) = \pi^{-1}W_V$.

Suppose that $(x, \varphi) \in \pi^{-1}W_U$ and fix $i \in n$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $x \in g_i W \subseteq Q$. Let $\psi \in 2^G$ such that $(g_i p, \psi)$ and (x, φ) belong to the same element P of $\Psi(Q)$ and let $g \in G$ such that $f \upharpoonright P = g \upharpoonright P$. Now fix $j \in n$ such that $\pi(f(g_i p, \psi)) = h_j p$. Thus $g g_i p = h_j p$ and since the action of G is free we get that $g g_i = h_j$ and therefore $\pi(f(x, \varphi)) = \pi(gx, g\varphi) = gx = h_j g_i^{-1}x \in h_j W$. This shows that $f(x, \varphi) \in \pi^{-1}W_V$, hence proving that $f(\pi^{-1}W_U) \subseteq \pi^{-1}W_V$. By a similar argument it follows that $f(\pi^{-1}W_V) \subseteq \pi^{-1}W_U$ and since $f^2 = id$ we get $f(\pi^{-1}W_U) = \pi^{-1}W_V$.

Finally we apply the last lemma one more time to get a partition $\mathcal{R}$ of $C \setminus (W_U \cup W_V)$ such that for each $R \in \mathcal{R}$ there is a $g_R \in G$ with $f \upharpoonright \pi^{-1}R = g_R \upharpoonright \pi^{-1}R$. Now we can define $h : C \rightarrow C$ as follows: if $x \in R \in \mathcal{R}$ let $h(x) = g_R(x)$, if $x \in g_i W$ let $h(x) = h_i g_i^{-1}(x)$ and if $x \in h_j W$ let $h(x) = g_j h_j^{-1}(x)$. It is clear that h is an autohomeomorphism of C , h is locally in G and $hU = V$. ♠

Definition 3.1 Suppose $(x, \varphi) \in Y$ and $|\pi^{-1}(x)| = 2$. Then $x = gp$ for some (unique) $g \in G$. We say that (x, φ) is of 0-type if $\varphi(g) = 0$ and (x, φ) is of 1-type if $\varphi(g) = 1$.

The next result shows that not all the clopens of Y are G -equivalent.

Lemma 3.3 Let $K = \{(x, \varphi) \in Y : \varphi(e) = 0\}$ where $e \in G$ is the identity element. Then K and $Y \setminus K$ are not G -equivalent.

Proof. By contradiction, fix a locally in G autohomeomorphism f of Y such that $fK = Y \setminus K$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $f^2 = id$. Let S be the set of all $x \in C$ such that $\pi^{-1}(x)$ has two points and f is defined by different elements of G at those two points. Then $f(\pi^{-1}S) = \pi^{-1}S$ and in fact $f(\pi^{-1}S \cap K) = \pi^{-1}S \cap (Y \setminus K)$. Note that $p \in S$ and that for any $x \in S$ with $x \neq p$ we either have $\pi^{-1}(x) \subseteq \pi^{-1}S \cap K$ or $\pi^{-1}(x) \subseteq \pi^{-1}S \cap (Y \setminus K)$. Thus $\pi^{-1}S \cap K$ has $n + 1$ points of 0-type and n points of 1-type while $\pi^{-1}S \cap (Y \setminus K)$ has n points of 0-type and $n + 1$ points of 1-type, where $|S| = 2n + 1$. But this is impossible since the action of G preserves the type of the points. ♠

Lemma 3.4 *Suppose that S is a sequence of closed subsets of C and (A_0, A_1) preserves gS for each $g \in G$. Suppose also that $x \in C$ is a strong limit point of S . Then every point in $\pi^{-1}(x)$ is a strong limit point of $\pi^{-1}S$.*

Proof. Fix $(a, \varphi) \in Y$ and suppose that a is a strong limit point of $S = \langle S_i : i \in I \rangle$. Fix $U \times W$ an open neighborhood of (a, φ) which may be assumed to be of the form $W = \{\psi \in 2^G : \sigma \subseteq \psi\}$ for some $\sigma \subseteq \varphi$ finite. If $g \in \text{dom}(\sigma)$ and $a \neq gp$ then $a \notin gA_{1-\sigma(g)}$ so there is an open V_g with $a \in V_g \subseteq U$ and $V_g \cap gA_{1-\sigma(g)} = \emptyset$. Let $V = \bigcap \{V_g : g \in \text{dom}(\sigma) \text{ and } a \neq gp\}$. Now we consider two cases:

- i) If $a = gp$ for some $g \in \text{dom}(\sigma)$ (since G acts freely, there is at most one such g) then $p = g^{-1}a \in g^{-1}V$ and p is a strong limit point of $g^{-1}S$. Therefore (since (A_0, A_1) preserves $g^{-1}S$) there is an $i \in I$ such that $g^{-1}S_i \subseteq g^{-1}V \setminus A_{1-\sigma(g)}$. Thus $S_i \subseteq V \setminus gA_{1-\sigma(g)}$.
- ii) if $a \neq gp$ for all $g \in \text{dom}(\sigma)$ then we just use the fact that a is a strong limit point of S to get an $i \in I$ for which $S_i \subseteq V \setminus \{a\}$.

In either case we get that $\pi^{-1}S_i \subseteq (U \times W) \setminus \{(a, \varphi)\}$, showing that (a, φ) is a strong limit point of $\pi^{-1}S$. ♠

4 Main Construction

We start with a fixed countable group G_0 of autohomeomorphisms of the Cantor space $C = 2^\omega$ which acts freely (i.e. $g(x) \neq x$ for all $x \in 2^\omega$ and for all $g \in G_0 \setminus \{id\}$). We construct a space $X \subseteq C \times C^{\omega_1}$, a group $G \supseteq G_0$ and a continuous action $* : G \times X \rightarrow X$ such that (here $\pi : C \times C^{\omega_1} \rightarrow C$ is the projection onto the first coordinate):

- i) X is compact, has no isolated points and $\pi \upharpoonright X$ is surjective.
- ii) X is hereditarily separable and has no non-trivial convergent sequences.
- iii) The action $*$ is free and for all $x \in X$ and $g \in G_0$, $g(\pi(x)) = \pi(g * x)$.
- iv) $\text{Hom}(X) \subseteq H(X, G)$
- v) $\{\pi^{-1}K : K \subseteq 2^\omega \text{ is clopen}\}$ forms a π -base of X .

We will define inductively $X_\alpha \subseteq C \times C^\alpha$ for $\alpha \leq \omega_1$ and then let $X = X_{\omega_1}$. We also construct groups G_α and actions $*_\alpha : G_\alpha \times X_\alpha \rightarrow X_\alpha$ and then let $G = G_{\omega_1}$ and $*$ is $*_{\omega_1}$. Actually, here we only give a guideline for constructing the G_α 's, leaving enough freedom so that we can use this same construction for the various applications.

For $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \omega_1$ let $\pi_\alpha^\beta : C \times C^\beta \rightarrow C \times C^\alpha$ be the obvious projection (we will often drop the superscript if $\beta = \omega_1$). To start just let $X_0 = C \times 1$ and $*_0$ is the natural action of G_0 induced in X_0 . We want the following conditions to hold on each step of the induction:

- C1)** X_α is closed in $C \times C^\alpha$ and has no isolated points.
- C2)** $\pi_\beta^\alpha(X_\alpha) = X_\beta$ for every $\beta \leq \alpha$.
- C3)** Each $*_\alpha$ is a free continuous action of G_α on X_α .
- C4)** If $\beta \leq \alpha$ then $G_\beta \subseteq G_\alpha$ and $\pi_\beta^\alpha(g *_\alpha x) = g *_\beta (\pi_\beta^\alpha(x))$ for all $x \in X_\alpha$ and $g \in G_\beta$.

This conditions almost determine the construction at limit ordinals. More precisely if γ is a limit ordinal then $X_\gamma = \bigcap_{\alpha \in \gamma} (\pi_\alpha^\gamma)^{-1}(X_\alpha)$, we let $G'_\gamma = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \gamma} G_\alpha$ and for any $g \in G'_\gamma$ and $x \in X_\gamma$, $g *_\gamma x$ is determined by the equations $\pi_\alpha^\gamma(g *_\gamma x) = g *_\alpha (\pi_\alpha^\gamma(x))$ for $\alpha_0 \leq \alpha < \gamma$ (where $\alpha_0 = \min\{\alpha : g \in G_\alpha\}$). Then for each particular application, we will choose some $G_\gamma \supseteq G'_\gamma$ and extend the action $*_\gamma$ to G_γ . Note then that i) and iii) will be satisfied. To make sure that ii) and iv) are also satisfied we need $\diamond$.

Assuming $\diamond$ we can fix $\{z_\gamma^\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1, \gamma \in \alpha\}$ such that $\langle z_\gamma^\alpha : \gamma \in \alpha \rangle$ is an α -sequence in $C \times C^\alpha$ for each $\alpha \in \omega_1$ and for every ω_1 -sequence $\langle x_\gamma : \gamma \in \omega_1 \rangle$ in $C \times C^{\omega_1}$, the set $\{\alpha \in \omega_1 : (\forall \gamma \in \alpha) \pi_\alpha^\gamma(x_\gamma) = z_\gamma^\alpha\}$ is stationary. Now we can state the following condition which will ensure that X is hereditarily separable (see [2] for more details):

- C5)** For all $\beta \leq \alpha \leq \omega_1$, if the z_γ^β 's are all distinct and in X_β then for all $x \in X_\alpha$ for which $\pi_\beta^\alpha(x)$ is a limit point of $\langle z_\gamma^\beta : \gamma \in \beta \rangle$ we have that x is a strong limit point of $\langle X_\alpha \cap (\pi_\beta^\alpha)^{-1}(z_\gamma^\beta) : \gamma \in \beta \rangle$.

We want X to have no convergent sequences. For this we can use our $\diamond$ -sequence to state the condition:

C6) If $\{z_n^\alpha : n \in \omega\}$ is a non-trivial convergent sequence in X_α with limit point $x \in X_\alpha$ then $|X_{\alpha+1} \cap (\pi_\alpha^{\alpha+1})^{-1}(x)| > 1$.

If $\langle x_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ was a convergent sequence in X then we can extend it to a sequence $\langle x_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1 \rangle$ in such a way that $\langle x_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ and $\langle x_\alpha : \alpha \geq \omega \rangle$ have disjoint closures. Then for some α we would have that $\langle \pi_\alpha(x_n) : n \in \omega \rangle = \langle z_n^\alpha : n \in \omega \rangle$ is a non-trivial convergence sequence with limit point say x . By C5) we have that any element of $(\pi_\alpha)^{-1}(x)$ is a limit point of $\langle x_n : n \in \omega \rangle$. On the other hand by C6) we have that $|(\pi_\alpha)^{-1}(x)| > 1$, which is a contradiction.

If h is a homeomorphism from X onto X , there is a club $Q_h \subseteq \omega_1$ and for each $\alpha \in Q_h$ there is a homeomorphism h_α from X_α onto X_α such that $\pi_\alpha(h(x)) = h_\alpha(\pi_\alpha(x))$ for all $x \in X$. On the other hand any continuous function is determined by its restriction to a dense subset. Thus we can use our $\diamond$ -sequence to capture continuous functions. Formally we make the requirement:

C7) If $\{z_n^\alpha : n \in \omega\}$ is a dense subset of X_α , f is a homeomorphism from X_α onto X_α such that $f(z_n^\alpha) = z_{\omega+n}^\alpha$ for $n \in \omega$ (note that there is at most one such f) and $f \notin H(X_\alpha, G_\alpha)$, then there is no autohomeomorphism h of X such that $\alpha \in Q_h$ and $h_\alpha = f$.

To satisfy C7) we construct for each $\alpha \in \omega_1$ (for which the hypothesis of C7) hold) two sequences $\langle a_n^\alpha : n \in \omega \rangle$ and $\langle b_n^\alpha : n \in \omega \rangle$ in X_α converging to a^α and b^α respectively, satisfying the following requirements:

R1) There is an $x \in X_{\alpha+1} \cap (\pi_\alpha^{\alpha+1})^{-1}(b^\alpha)$ which is not a strong limit point of the sequence $\langle X_{\alpha+1} \cap (\pi_\alpha^{\alpha+1})^{-1}(b_n^\alpha) : n \in \omega \rangle$.

R2) For all $\beta \leq \alpha \leq \omega_1$ and for all $x \in X_\alpha \cap (\pi_\beta^\alpha)^{-1}(a^\beta)$ we have that x is a strong limit point of $\langle X_\alpha \cap (\pi_\beta^\alpha)^{-1}(a_n^\beta) : n \in \omega \rangle$.

R3) $f(a_n^\alpha) = b_n^\alpha$ for all $n \in \omega$.

Note that if we can meet the last three requirements then C7) is automat-

ically satisfied because if h was a counterexample, it would have to send the sequence $\langle X \cap (\pi_\alpha)^{-1}(a_n^\alpha) : n \in \omega \rangle$ into the sequence $\langle X \cap (\pi_\alpha)^{-1}(b_n^\alpha) : n \in \omega \rangle$ and the set $X \cap (\pi_\alpha)^{-1}(a^\alpha)$ into the set $X \cap (\pi_\alpha)^{-1}(b^\alpha)$. But this is impossible because any point in $X \cap (\pi_\alpha)^{-1}(a^\alpha)$ is a strong limit point of the first sequence while there are points in $X \cap (\pi_\alpha)^{-1}(b^\alpha)$ which are not a strong limit points of the second sequence.

Finally, to make sure that ν holds at the end (and in fact at each stage of the construction), we fix in advance an enumeration $\{W_n : n \in \omega\}$ of the clopen subsets of $C \times 1$ and make the requirement:

C8) For each $\alpha \leq \omega_1$ and for all $x \in X_\alpha$, x is a strong limit point of $\langle X_\alpha \cap (\pi_0^\alpha)^{-1}(W_n) : n \in \omega \rangle$.

All conditions are automatically satisfied at limit stages.

For the successor stage, fix $\alpha \in \omega_1$ and assume X_β , G_β and $*_\beta$ have been constructed for all $\beta \leq \alpha$. Now we define $X_{\alpha+1}$ and we show how to lift the action of $G_\alpha (= G'_{\alpha+1})$ to $X_{\alpha+1}$. Then in each particular application of the construction we will define $G_{\alpha+1} \supseteq G'_{\alpha+1}$ and extend the action.

Let $\mathcal{S}''$ be the set of all sequences of the form $\langle g(X_\alpha \cap (\pi_\beta^\alpha)^{-1}(z_\gamma^\beta)) : \gamma \in \beta \rangle$ with $g \in G_\alpha$ and $\beta \leq \alpha$ such that the z_γ^β 's are all distinct and in X_β , together with all the sequences of the form $\langle g(X_\alpha \cap (\pi_\beta^\alpha)^{-1}(a_n^\beta)) : n \in \omega \rangle$ with $g \in G_\alpha$ and $\beta < \alpha$ (β for which condition C7) was considered), together with the sequence $\langle X_\alpha \cap (\pi_0^\alpha)^{-1}(W_n) : n \in \omega \rangle$.

If $f : X_\alpha \rightarrow X_\alpha$ satisfies the hypothesis of C7) fix $a^\alpha \in X_\alpha$ witness of the fact that $f \notin H(X_\alpha, G_\alpha)$ (i.e. there is no clopen neighborhood of a^α on which f acts as an element of G_α) and let $b^\alpha = f(a^\alpha)$. If there is a $g_0 \in G_\alpha$ such that $g_0 *_\alpha a^\alpha = b^\alpha$ then find a sequence $\langle O_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ of clopen subsets of X_α converging to a^α such that for all $n \in \omega$ and all $x \in O_n$ we have that $g_0 *_\alpha x \neq f(x)$. Otherwise (if there is no such a g_0) choose any sequence $\langle O_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ of clopen subsets of X_α converging to a^α .

Let $\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S}'' \cup \{\langle f(O_n) : n \in \omega \rangle\}$. Look at $\{b^\alpha\}$ as a constant sequence and apply Lemma 2.2 with $\mathcal{S}'$ to get corresponding closed A'_0 and A'_1 subsets of X_α such that (A'_0, A'_1) preserves each sequence in $\mathcal{S}'$. Note that by condition C1) we have that $X_\alpha \approx C$ so we can indeed use Lemma 2.2.

By construction there is a sequence $\{n_i : i \in \omega\} \subseteq \omega$ such that the subsequence $\langle f(O_{n_i}) : i \in \omega \rangle$ is entirely contained in A'_0 and converges to the point b^α . Now we choose $b_i^\alpha \in f(O_{n_i})$ and let $a_i^\alpha = f^{-1}(b_i^\alpha)$ for $i \in \omega$.

There are two reasons for choosing the b_i^α 's in this way. The first one is that $\{b_i^\alpha : i \in \omega\}$ still avoids $\mathcal{S}'$ and the second reason is that $\{b_i^\alpha : i \in \omega\}$ also avoids the set $\{\langle g *_\alpha a_n^\alpha : n \in \omega \rangle : g \in G_\alpha\}$.

Thus if we let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}' \cup \{\langle g *_\alpha a_n^\alpha : n \in \omega \rangle : g \in G_\alpha\}$ we can use Lemma 2.2 again to get $A_0, A_1 \subseteq X_\alpha$ closed such that $A_0 \cup A_1 = X_\alpha$, $A_0 \cap A_1 = \{b^\alpha\}$, $\{b_i^\alpha : i \in \omega\} \subseteq A_0$ and (A_0, A_1) preserves each sequence in $\mathcal{S}$.

If the hypothesis of C6) are satisfied (and hence the ones for C7) are not) and x is the limit point of $\{z_n^\alpha : n \in \omega\}$ then we just apply Lemma 2.2 directly to the set $\mathcal{S}''$ to get A_0, A_1 with $A_0 \cap A_1 = \{x\}$. If neither the hypothesis of C7) nor the ones for C6) are satisfied we do the same with an arbitrary $x \in X_\alpha$.

Identifying X_α with the cantor set C , we can now construct $Y(A_0, A_1, G) \subseteq X_\alpha \times 2^G$ as in the previous section and then identifying 2^G with C we get $X_{\alpha+1} \subseteq X_\alpha \times C$.

It is clear from the construction that all the requirements are preserved. For C5) just use Lemma 3.4. Note that X_α has no isolated points by condition C8).

5 Applications

We assume $\diamond$ throughout this section.

Theorem 5.1 *There is a rigid Fedorchuck space.*

Proof. In the main construction just let $G_\alpha = 1$ for all $\alpha \leq \omega_1$. ♠

Theorem 5.2 *There is an h -homogeneous Fedorchuck space.*

Proof. Let $\{(K_\gamma, L_\gamma) : \gamma \in \omega_1\}$ be an enumeration of all pairs of disjoint non-empty clopen subsets of $C \times C^{\omega_1}$. Let $G_0 = 1$ and assume G'_α has been defined. Let γ_0 be the smallest γ not considered at a previous stage for which both K_γ and L_γ have their supports contained in α . Let $K = X_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha K_{\gamma_0}$ and $L = X_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha L_{\gamma_0}$. If both K and L are non-empty (and hence clopen in X_α), apply Lemma 2.3 to get $G_\alpha = \langle G'_\alpha, g \rangle$ acting freely on X_α and having $gK = L$. This clearly ensures that X_{ω_1} is h -homogeneous. ♠

Theorem 5.3 *There is a zero-dimensional, hereditarily separable compact space X which is B -homogeneous but not h -homogeneous.*

Proof. Start with G_0 acting freely on 2^ω such that any two disjoint clopen subsets are G -equivalent (for example one could use Lemma 2.3 $\aleph_0$ times). Then keep $G_\alpha = G_0$ for all $\alpha \leq \omega_1$, in particular $G = G_0$. By Lemma 3.3, X_1 has already two disjoint non- G -equivalent clopen subsets and by Lemma 3.2 these remain non- G -equivalent (and hence non homeomorphic to each other) in X . However by Lemma 2.1, X is still B -homogeneous. ♠

Under $MA + \neg CH$ any hereditarily separable compact space is first countable, so if it is also B -homogeneous it would have to be h -homogeneous by [5]. Thus our space could not have been constructed in ZFC . We don't know if there is a counterexample to Matveev's question in ZFC (but again, if there is one, it can't be hereditarily separable).

References

- [1] R. de la Vega, K. Kunen, *A compact homogeneous S -space*, Top. Appl. 136 (2004), 123-127
- [2] M. Dzamonja, K. Kunen, *Measures on compact HS spaces*, Fund. Math. 143 (1993), 41-54
- [3] V.V. Fedorchuk, *On the cardinality of hereditarily separable compact spaces*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 222 (1975), 302-305 (in Russian)
- [4] K. Kunen, *Compact L -spaces and right topological groups*, Top. Proc. 24 (1999), 295-327
- [5] M.V. Matveev, *Basic homogeneity in the class of zero-dimensional spaces*, Filomat 12:2 (1998), 13-20